

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/314,424	Applicant(s) BURKE, BERTRAM V.	
	Examiner Jean D Janvier	Art Unit 3622	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Jean D Janvier. (3) Mr. Burke (Inventor).
 (2) Mr. Leo Stange (Attorney). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 03 February 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: US Patent 5,466,919 and 'Flowers as Double Gift'.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

JEAN D. JANVIER
PRIMARY EXAMINER


 Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In general, Applicant believes that his invention is patentable over the prior art thus far used in the rejections for his system does not involve the merchant or retailer in selecting a charity that will receive the accumulated rebate and the merchant does not know per se the identities of the charities selected by the user or donor. However, the Examiner notes that these features or the argued features are not positively disclosed in the claims. Further, the Examiner does not read limitations from the specification into the claimed invention. To this end, the Applicant is about to amend the claims to incorporate the argued features as discussed above.